

Date: Sat, 30 Jul 94 04:30:18 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #336
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 30 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 336

Today's Topics:

 A quiet voice for Novice Class NOT time-limited
 CW is FUN!! reprise
 Q: What is 303MHz allocated for?
 W5YI - dirty trick
 What is wrong with ham radio

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 1994 02:43:28 GMT
From: news.pipeline.com!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@uunet.uu.net
Subject: A quiet voice for Novice Class NOT time-limited
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <gganderson.516.775419180@augustana.edu>, Kevin Anderson -7325
(gganderson@augustana.edu) writes:

>Several posts in the "Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby" thread
>suggested limiting the time limit for Novice/Tech/Tech+
>licenses.
>
>As a recent Novice-class licensee, yet one very interested
>in radio and learning its technical material, I would be
>against that limitation.
>
>For now I am very happy with the amount of radio I can do
>with a Novice class. There are enough privileges for me

>to play with to keep me busy for quite some time. There is
>nothing stopping me from earning awards (WAS, DXCC, etc),
>from contesting, from 222-mhz packet/FM, etc. I can also
>learn just as much technical material and operating procedures
>as you can with the higher languages. I can pass traffic
>in slow-speed nets. And I can do data, I just have to be on
>10m when conditions are good, that's all--I can live with that
>because it respects propagation for what it is. I can't be
>on 2m, that's true, but I don't mind that; 222 mhz is plenty
>open most of the time.
>
>I don't need a higher grade license to have fun, nor should
>anyone else, as long as one is willing to work within the
>limitations of their license class. I don't need a higher
>class radio license to prove to anyone what I know.
>It is all personal motivation to maximize the enjoyment of
>a hobby/interest, or to dictate the amount of technical knowledge
>one knows. If one can't have some level of fun at any license
>class they are able to achieve, then something might be wrong
>with that person. I can upgrade my license tomorrow if I chose,
>but I'm just having too much fun in the meantime to worry about!
>
>No need to put a time limit on it -- there should be other
>incentives driving one to learn more.
>

The situation for a Novice is very different than that for a Tech. I think the Novice privileges are much more in line with the testing required than are the Tech privileges, where everything above 30MHz is awarded by taking what for many (most?) is an *easier* test. I think the carrot of more privileges is enough to motivate most Novices, but I don't feel the same about the Tech license

73,
Mike, KK6GM

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 1994 16:51:06 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!gopher.sdsc.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
darwin.sura.net!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW is FUN!! reprise
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <BowSzo3.brunelli_pc@delphi.com> brunelli_pc@delphi.com writes:

>

>Instead of claiming that "my mode is better than your mode..."
>how about a re-evaluation of the current state of spectrum
>management at HF. I would love to see a digital-modes subband
>on bands like 20, 15 and 40 or 80. With access granted to tech-plus

>licences. A formalized 25 (?) Khz chunk at about 7075, 14075...
>would be awesome. Also, there is nothing stopping digital modes
>in the novice bands...maybe (is it CW only???)

>
>You better start swimmin or you'll sink like a stone...
>
>73 de n1qdg

In case you haven't noticed, starting sometime this fall or winter, approx.
137 KHz of HF spectrum will be carved out for exclusive use of automatic
packet stations. These frequencies will be taken from CW/RTTY/Novice
operators. Think I am kidding? Check it out in the August QST. Who do you
propose to take your frequencies from? How about picking on the voice modes
for a change?

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov

=====
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
=====

... .. _ _ . _ . _ _ . _ _ . _ _ . _ _ . _ _

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 94 00:44:19 GMT
From: spcuna!starcomm.overleaf.com!n2ayj!n2ayj@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Q: What is 303MHz allocated for?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <316db6\$rn8@vixen.cso.uiuc.edu> mitchell@ncsa.uiuc.edu writes:
>
>The subject just about says it all. I've got an interesting
>device which I don't know what it does. One thing I do know is
>that it appears to have a 303MHz transmitter in it. If someone
>could e-mail me and let me know what the 'official' use of this
>band is, I would really appreciate it.

Und ve voot be FERRY hinterested to knowing frumm vere yo haf
obtain-ed diss dewice, hmmm? ;-)

--

Stan Olochwoszcz, N2AYJ - n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com
P.C. Simpletons Charged in Death of Humor. Film at eleven.

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 1994 18:05:06 GMT
From: gatech!newsfeed.pitt.edu!gvls1!rossi@uunet.uu.net
Subject: W5YI - dirty trick
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Everyone wants me to renew my license. I *know* it expires in November so I picked up the latest 610 back in the spring from the local VE group and I was planning to mail it sometime this summer...

...then about a month ago I get this nice letter (and a 610) from W5YI reminding me that my license will expire soon. I figure that I might as well send for my renewal now since with the long delays, who knows, it just might take until November to get processed. I had planned on sending in *my* 610 directly to the FCC but since I had W5YI's 610 right in front of me, I figured I would use that one instead. BUT... their 610 did not have the FCC's address on it.

So I am thinking... That's strange... The FCC publishes a 610 without their address on it? Huh? The FCC can't be that dumb! :-)

So a couple days go by while I try to track down the FCC's address... I remembered seeing it somewhere in QST...

... meanwhile the ARRL sends me a letter (and another 610) reminding me that my license will expire soon. The thing is, the ARRL 610 is a 2 page job. The W5YI 610 was only 1 page. Hmmmm.. The FCC's address is on the SECOND PAGE which W5YI does not include. Boy, what a dirty trick. W5YI wants you to mail the 610 to them with \$5 so they REMOVE THE FCC's ADDRESS from the form. They say you can mail it directly to the FCC but don't give you the address.

I figure I have to address an envelope and mail it either way so why should I send to W5YI along with \$5 (and introduce more delay into an already slow system) when I can just as easily address the envelope directly to the FCC in Gettysburg without the \$5?

A truly active and responsible ham should be aware of when his license will expire but if a "company" like W5YI wants to send out friendly reminders and 610 forms at least they should send a COMPLETE 610. Their 610 was not even the same color as the one from the ARRL. I hope it works.

Anyway, I got the FCC's address off of the ARRL's 610 and mailed for my renewal on July 18th. Let's see... If it really takes 17 weeks then I should

see my new license about a week before the old one expires... Let's see..

Just my \$0.02

=====

Pete Rossi - WA3NNA

rossi@vfl.paramax.COM

Unisys Corporation - Government Systems Group
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania

=====

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 1994 07:53:57 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!swiss.ans.net!
malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@ames.arpa
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <paulf.775434350@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, Paul Flaherty
(paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU) writes:

>As an aside, my current feeling of the consensus of .policy is that just about
>everyone would like to the current license structure changed, to one which
>has only two or three licenses, with the HF classes requiring 5 wpm or 5 and
>10-13 wpm. Folks who want to maintain the current structure or nuke CW
>entirely are generally a tiny minority. It's important to keep in mind that
>this is therefore *not* an all-or-nothing issue.

>

Is this really the consensus? I sure don't see it that way. Those who
oppose the code don't seem to me in much of a compromising mood. All
of their arguments logically lead to elimination of the code
requirement, or at most folding the code score into a total score.

Thinking to a codeless future, if we really are serious about
requiring the same amount of effort to get a license, how does the
effort to learn the code translate into additional requirements on a
codeless written? Do we just try to estimate an average manhour
figure for learning 5 and 13 wpm, and come up with a corresponding
average figure for additional regs, theory and operating procedures?
Won't this translate to a much tougher written? If so, is that what
we want? Or, is the end result of all this going to be, despite all
claims and protestations to the contrary, another decrease in the
amount of work needed to get a license (surprise, surprise)?

Mike, KK6GM

Date: 28 Jul 1994 20:29:45 -0600

From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <318of3\$3h6@chnews.intel.com>, <31931g\$6er@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<319ah1\$mq4@chnews.intel.com>

Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <319ah1\$mq4@chnews.intel.com>,

<Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.hf.intel.com> wrote:

>Hi Jay, I do not want to lower the requirements. I want to raise the
>_relevant_ requirements and lower the _irrelevant_ requirements.

I want to raise the relevant requirements for a college degree and lower the
irrelevant requirements. I'll support your argument when you support mine.

> The

>written tests are a joke and should be toughened up considerably. Mental
>knowledge should be the filter, not the physical ability to emulate a bad
>modem.

Yet another engineer who wants a ham corps full of engineers.

> I use CW and there is definitely a place for it, but not as a
>monument to a distant, fading past. CW is just another mode, one of many.

It is also a balance to technical requirements. The current structure has the
distinct advantage that _everyone_ has to work to get a license and to advance
within the ranks. Relaxing the CW requirement and toughening the theory tests
would badly skew that, away from the average person and toward the engineer.
That's a popular idea on this network full of engineers, but it would fall
flat on its face out in the real world.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"From now on, when someone asks you where you're from, you tell 'em
'Houston, city of champions!'" -- Rudy Tomjanovich

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 1994 16:38:36 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!

darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORN.L.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!

wyn@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <31282t\$ctr@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <313dne\$gpg@chnews.intel.com>,
<313vv0\$fnj@agate.berkeley.edu>
Subject : Re: Where's the key?

In article <313vv0\$fnj@agate.berkeley.edu> kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken
A. Nishimura) writes:

>>

>WHOA, STOP, HALT!

>Before we get going on a flame war about CW vs. CCW vs. SS vs. any
>other modulation method, let's make sure the playing field is
>level. What are we talking about? Ability to get
>a signal through a constant background of white noise?
>Ability to get through in an environment of lots of independent
>narrowband signals? How are we measuring transmitted power?

[bunch of great stuff deleted]

>==Ken

Thanks again for an excellent post, shining a brief light of truth through
the pall of clueless bliss pervading the forum.

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov

=====
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
=====

... _ . . . _ . _ . _ . . _ . _ . _ . _ . _ . _ . _ . _ . _ . _

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 1994 02:38:43 GMT
From: news.pipeline.com!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3113tg\$03m@crl4.crl.com>, <424@ted.win.net>,
<Anthony_Pelliccio-260794113504@adis-204.adis.brown.edu><lenwink.132.00087A34@indirect.com>du
Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)
Subject : Re: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?

In article <lenwink.132.00087A34@indirect.com>, Len Winkler (lenwink@indirect.com)

writes:

>In article <Anthony_Pelliccio-260794113504@adis-204.adis.brown.edu>
Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>

>>In article <424@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) wrote:

>

>>> Has anyone here argued that all hams must be technical experts? (Well,
>>> maybe one person...) There's a vast area between technical

>>> illiterate and technical expert, and that's where most hams reside.

>>> One of the purposes of incentive licensing is to move folks away from

>>> the technical-illiterate starting line, but if a person is satisfied

>>> with the privileges of one of the entry-level licenses then what?

>>> Limited-duration entry-level licenses, anyone?

>

>>I agree with having a limited duration for both the novice, tech+, and tech
>>licensees. Say 2 years.

>

>Does that mean we should penalize those who are no-code techs, get on
>2m, have fun for about 3 months, then by elmering (remember elmering?),
>learn about packet, get on packet, enjoy that for about 6 months, then find
>out that ATV is fun and learn about it and get on ATV for a length of time,
>then find out about AMSAT and become active in satellite work, then go
>on to moonbounce, etc.; should they LOSE their license because they
>don't take another test? Just wondering...

>73, Len, KB7LPW

>>

Everyone seems to at least pay lip service to the notion that our
written exams, especially the entry-level ones, are too easy, and are
being passed by people who have no grasp of the material. This is
usually followed by a suggestion that the tests be made harder. By
having a limited duration entry-level license, we would just be making
it easier for people to reach that higher level of knowledge, rather
than having to do it all at one sitting, *before* they ever touched a
ham radio. It's a helping hand up, not a slapping down. Wouldn't
your Tech Poster Boy above be eager to upgrade to a higher level
no-code license if one were offered? Of course he would. The
question, again, is do we force a higher level of knowledge on a
beginner immediately, or do we let them in the hobby for a while so that
they can learn by doing, and then require them to move to a higher
level? Never in the history of U.S. amateur radio have the
requirements for a *permanent* license been as low as they are
today, and I think that's changing the character of the hobby for the
worse.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Fri, 29 Jul 1994 11:26:48 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <paulf.774906446@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
<RFM.94Jul27112856@urth.eng.sun.com>, <rogjdCtnJH3.DKn@netcom.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <rogjdCtnJH3.DKn@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington)
writes:

>Richard McAllister (rfm@urth.eng.sun.com) wrote:

>: In article <MFcDKiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net> domonkos@access.digex.net (Andy
Domonkos) writes:

>

>: >I went from 0 to 15 wpm in 30 days.

>

>: Some people have the talent. It took me about 6 months of 30-60 minutes a

>: day, which is a large portion of my free time. I think I'm more typical.

>: Others have tried for years and never cracked the 10 WPM barrier. It's hard

>: to tell ahead of time how long it will take a given person to learn.

>

>6 months of 30-60 minutes/day is wildly more than it takes 99% of the

>hams to learn cw. Something was wrong with your study approach.

Something is wrong with your sample. No doubt 99% of (pre-code test
free licensing) *hams* didn't have as much trouble learning Morse,
those who did have trouble aren't *hams*. They gave up.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 29 Jul 1994 13:17:58 -0400
From: news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References

<Anthony_Pelliccio-260794113504@adis-204.adis.brown.edu><lenwink.132.00087A34@indi
rect.com>, <433@ted.win.net>, <bmicales.179.2E390EE1@facstaff.wisc.edu>

Subject : Re: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?

> the general class so special?

Not understanding the theory is ALL the justification needed to keep un-qualified operators off HF. I'm getting tired of new-ops asking me how to measure SWR on a 2M rig and the antenna. What was all that stuff for in the study guides then? I would have been laughed off the air (hell, I would've been ashamed to ask it) 17 years ago. These folks should have bought their GMRS license and be satisfied w/that.

Andy

Date: 29 Jul 1994 13:06:56 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!isuvax.iastate.edu!TWP77@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CtLtzo.IpJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <zQyDkiubG2Z5066yn@access.digex.net>,
<318mdl\$ah3@news.iastate.edu>,<Cto1F0.L1x@news.Hawaii.Edu>x.

Reply-To : twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu

Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <Cto1F0.L1x@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>Will, I don't recall hearing anyone say that. The reasons for learning
>code are substantial, the least of which is ``I had to so - so should
>you''.

Yes, there are reasons for learning code. However, most arguments given on this group have centered on the "whining" on technicians and how people want something for nothing. This "getting something for nothing" is just another way of saying "I had to, so do you"--although in a perhaps more concealed, and possibly polite, form.

>How come you're using an anonymous account, now?

I am not using an anonymous account. If I was, you wouldn't have found out my name...

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #336
